

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated February 28, 2008. Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19, and 21 are in independent form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1-7, 14-16, and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Archived Web Pages allegedly dated August 16, 2000 (*Yahoo!*), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,892,307 (*Wood et al.*). Applicants submit that independent Claims 1, 5, 14-16, 19, and 21, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Initially, Applicants respectfully submit that an important feature of Claim 1 has not been addressed in any of the Office Actions, particularly “wherein the user is enabled to select a different method of authentication for access to the restricted service without accessing the restricted service, and wherein the registered method of authentication is presented as the method of authentication for subsequent attempts to gain access to the restricted service without requiring subsequent re-registration of the registered method, until such time as the user selects such different method of authentication.” (Emphasis added.) By virtue of these features, a user-selected registered method of authentication may be maintained, and the user is able to login with a different method of authentication while still maintaining the original registered method of authentication.

Further, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action’s characterization of *Yahoo!*. The Office Action, at page 2, again cites *Yahoo!*’s instance of a username and password as disclosing a “method of authentication.” An instance of a

username and password are underlying data – not a “method of authentication.” In Applicants’ view, a “method of authentication” concerns the method of authenticating, not this underlying data. For example, a “method of authentication” may include a method of utilizing a username and password; smart card and PIN; user identification and pass-phrase; biometric with or without a password, etc.¹ See Specification, paragraph [0026]. Changing a first username and password to a second username and/or password, in Applicants’ view, does not amount to changing the “method of authentication.”

Even if, for argument’s sake, an instance of a username and password qualifies as a “method of authentication,” *Yahoo!* still does not provide a capability to maintain a user-selected registered method of authentication, and allow a user to login with a different method of authentication from the registered method of authentication while still maintaining the original registered method of authentication. Indeed, Applicants submit that *Yahoo!* cannot be modified to provide these features, nor has the Office Action shown how this would be possible.

Nothing has been found in *Yahoo!* that would teach, suggest, or otherwise result in the feature “wherein the user is enabled to select a different method of authentication for access to the restricted service without accessing the restricted service, and wherein the registered method of authentication is presented as the method of authentication for subsequent attempts to gain access to the restricted service without requiring subsequent re-registration of the registered method, until such time as the user selects such different method of authentication,” as recited in Claim 1.

¹ The example(s) presented herein are intended for illustrative purposes only. Any details presented in the illustrative example(s) should not be construed to be limitations on the claims.

Wood et al. does not remedy the deficiencies of *Yahoo!*. *Wood et al.*, as best understood by Applicants, relates to a security architecture in which a single sign-on is provided for multiple information resources. The security architecture associates trust-level requirements with information resources. Authentication schemes are associated with trust levels and a login service obtains credentials for an entity commensurate with the trust-level requirements of an information resource to be accessed. During login, the user is permitted to select from suitable authentication schemes and to provide an associated login credential. Apparently, in *Wood et al.*, the user-selected authentication scheme is not registered for subsequent use. Instead, the user must select an authentication scheme every time the user logs in.

Nothing has been found in *Wood et al.* that is believed to teach, suggest, or otherwise result in even “registering the user-selected method of authentication” much less “wherein the user is enabled to select a different method of authentication for access to the restricted service without accessing the restricted service, and wherein the registered method of authentication is presented as the method of authentication for subsequent attempts to gain access to the restricted service without requiring subsequent re-registration of the registered method, until such time as the user selects such different method of authentication,” as recited in Claim 1. (Emphasis added.)

Even if the proposed combination of *Yahoo!* and *Wood et al.* were permissible, at best, a user could register multiple username and password combinations, which still fails to enable a user to login through any method other than a registered method.

For at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the Office cannot sufficiently establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness against Claim 1, and that the proposed combination of *Yahoo!* and *Wood et al.*, even if deemed legally permissible or technically feasible, would fail to arrive at the method of Claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Independent Claims 5, 14-16, 19, and 21 include features similar to those discussed above in connection with Claim 1. Therefore, those claims also are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above.

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual reconsideration of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Should issues remain following a careful consideration of the present request for reconsideration, the courtesy of a telephone interview to provide clarification concerning those issues and discuss possible claim language to address the issues is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan Berschadsky/
Jonathan Berschadsky
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS_WS 2033021_1